

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/879,529	SHIMIZU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis Rosario	2624	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Final

(1) Dennis Rosario.

(3) _____

(2) Ido Tuchman.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 July 2007

Time: 1100

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

Claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:

Aoyama et al. (US Patent 6,535,651), Huang (US Patent 6,295,091 B1), Greggain et al. (US Patent 5,991,463) and Yamashita et al. (US Patent 5,347,599)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner presented the above mentioned prior art that was considered pertinent as teaching/disclosing claim 1 in the amendment of 6/15/07. Discussed how Aoyama and Huang may disclose the newly amended limitations of claim 1. The examiner concluded during the interview that claim 1 was not anticipated by Aoyama, Greggain and Yamashita, however, Huang may anticipate/teach claim 1 pending more consideration and an updated search..